

### Response

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-27 have been rejected. Applicant has amended Claims 1-8 and 10-20 to correct inadvertent errors. Applicant has cancelled Claim 9 without prejudice. No new matter has been added with this amendment.

5

### Request to accept Replacement Drawing Sheet

Applicant requests that Figure 1 replacement sheet be accepted to correct for an inadvertent error of labeling two items 30 when one of the items should have been labeled 40.

10

### Oath/Declaration

Per the Examiner's request, a new oath has been provided. As such, this objection should have been overcome.

### Objections

Claim 19 has been amended to delete the phrase "said long exposure time is sufficient to capture the complete interferogram." As such, Claim 19 objection should be moot.

15

### 35 USC §112 Rejections

Claim 18 phrase "relatively long" has been deleted. Thus, the rejection of Claim 18 on this basis should now be moot.

20

### 35 USC §102 rejections

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 17-22 was rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Partynski (US 6,826,358). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Nonetheless, independent Claims 1 and 20 has been herein amended to include elements not taught, suggested, or motivated by the above cited reference for the aiming means including: . . . mirrors being mounted . . . in a plane substantially parallel to a target to provide substantially orthogonal observation of a ground position, aiming means responsiveness to three orthogonally positioned gyrometers that measure a rotation rate of the unstable carrier platform about the at least two of said axes and wherein the aiming means occurs without requiring reorientation of the imaging platform and that movement of the at least one of said mirrors occurs in a substantially continuous pattern that predicatively mirrors motion of the aircraft at approximately

30

a similar angular velocity and accelerations as the unstable carrier platform. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification, for instance, in paragraph [0031] “. . . The platform can be solidly affixed to any optical imaging or projecting system . . . The platform is then attached to the CP [Carrier Platform]”; in paragraph [0033] . . . “The mirrors (1,2) are mounted in a plane  
5 with the imaging system (30), and that plane is parallel to the target ground, allowing the imaging system to “see” perpendicular to the ground . . .”; and finally in paragraph [0035] . . . “the mirrors move in a continuous and smooth pattern predicatively “mirroring” the aircraft motion . . . By setting the mirrors in a continuous motion of the same angular velocities and accelerations as the CP [Carrier Platform]”.

10 As such, Applicant believes amended Claims 1 and 20 have overcome the rejection on this basis. Furthermore, dependent Claims 7-8, 10-11, 17-19 based on their dependence on amended independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 21 and 22 based on their dependence of amended independent Claim 20 on this basis should now also be in condition for allowance.

15 35 USC §103 rejections

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Partynski (US 6,826,358). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant has herein cancelled Claim 9 without prejudice so the rejection on this basis should be moot.

20 Claims 12-16, 23-27 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Partynski (US 6,826,358). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Dependent Claims 12-16 and 23-27 should now be allowable based on its dependence respectively on amended independent Claims 1 or 20 for the reasons discussed above. As such, dependent Claims 12-16 and 23-27 should now on this basis be in condition for allowance.

25 Other Comments

Applicant hereby reserves the right to prosecute claims of different or broader scope in a continuation or divisional application.

30 Applicant notes claim cancellations or additions are made solely for the purposes of more clearly and particularly describing and claiming the invention, and not for purposes of patentability or overcoming any art.

The Examiner should infer no adoption of a position with respect to patentability, change in the Applicant's position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the invention, or acquiescence to any position taken by the Examiner, based on cancellations or additions.

Furthermore, any remarks made with respect to a given claim or claims are limited solely  
5 to such claim or claims.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments which may be resolved over the telephone, he is requested to call the undersigned at (310) 348-8195.

10 Respectfully submitted,

15 Date: May 13, 2008

By:



Robert E. Kasody  
Registration No. 50,268

20

Law Office of Robert E. Kasody  
6601 Center Drive West, Suite 500  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone No.: (310) 348-8195  
Facsimile No.: (866) 449-3390